

**City of Lake Forest Park**  
**Parks and Recreation Advisory Board**  
**Regular Meeting Summary**  
**January 23, 2024**

**CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 P.M.**

**PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Tyler Dittman, Richie Allen, Alice Pedersen, Eric Zhang, Amy Hanegan, Josh Rosenau

**STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT:**

Cory Roche – Environmental & Sustainability Specialist

Councilmember Lorri Bodi

Amber Mikluscak – DCG/Watershed

Chuck McDowell – DCG/Watershed

Kenny Booth - DCG/Watershed

Jack Chaffin - Johnston Architects

Jeffrey Hee - TSI

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT:**

None

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Alice motioned to approve the agenda, Josh seconded the motion to approve, the agenda was approved unanimously.

**REVIEW/APPROVE MEETING MINUTES**

Josh motioned to approve the November Meeting Minutes, Amy seconded the motion to approve, meeting minutes approved unanimously.

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE LAKEFRONT PARK PROJECT WITH CONSULTANTS**

The Parks Board received a presentation of the concept design alternatives from the Lakefront Park consultant, DCG/Watershed, that included discussion on:

- Schedule review

- March 14th Council Meeting has been cancelled; special meeting may be needed – Cory to coordinate. Special meeting will replace 3/14 CC mtg in project schedule.
- PRAB deliberation – Board members noted need for subsequent discussion meeting the week of Jan 29 – Cory to coordinate (Zoom format; design team will not attend)
- February 21st Community Meeting coincides with Kenmore school midwinter break; families with school aged kids may not be around to attend
  - Investigate online workshop option in concert with in-person
  - Offer take-home or print-at-home version of exercises through website
- 1/25/2024 – Schedule updated following coordination meeting between city and DCG/Watershed.

#### • Permitting overview

- Park in a residential area, critical areas – wetlands, stream, shoreline regulations
  - This requires impact to be minimum necessary to fulfill project purpose
- Dock – Shoreline regulations do not speak to public docks – code is written for residential docks
  - City has opportunity to make revisions to the shoreline code; SMP update currently in process. Ideally code is clarified prior to submitting project applications.
- State and federal agencies for shoreline and stream impacts
  - Tribal component to the work – Keep tribes involved and engaged in this process.
  - Existing dock is condemned – this dock needs to be removed before park could be safely opened. Dock removal requires state and federal permits.

#### • Presentation of Concept Design Alternatives

- Concepts and costs are planning-level—lots of opportunity for cost management through design refinement
  - Estimates helps us understand and identify key drivers for cost
  - Cost breakdown is detailed, but still represents assumptions and estimates
  - Phasing will be explored during preferred design development; could be informed by funding availability and decisions
- Mitigation will need to be focused around areas that are impacted – Mitigation sequencing required (must demonstrate avoidance first, then minimization, then mitigation)

#### • Concept design strategy

- Architecture
  - How to maintain character of house – design detail will be further explored during next phase of design
  - Medium Option – provides bathroom in house and covered area connected to outdoor bathroom
  - All options take down part of the garage structure
  - Medium and large options provide more windows – large glass doors out to deck
- Lakefront shelter
  - If provided, chimney could be used for bbq, firepit, ect.
- Preserve
  - Invasive removal could be a part of volunteer projects; certain funding programs allow volunteer hours to be documented and offered as in-kind match for grant funding
- Staging and Play Area
  - Wide path also serves as emergency access route
  - Can investigate play equipment specific grants
- Parking
  - Base program of each parking options – no difference between options in terms of bus drop-off area

- Minimum option allows for renovation of Cabin 6, but does not require it. Cabin 6 can be demolished in either parking option.
- Beach
  - Removal of hard armoring at the edge of the lake will contribute to shoreline mitigation
  - Code unclear on paddlecraft launching (standup paddleboard, etc.). Team will dig into requirements for separated boat launching area; may require clarification of city code. Kayak launch would be accommodated at end of dock (either option).
- Parking
  - Drop off and load/unload space critical for success of building program (rental). Some parking needed. Could be addressed operationally, such as parking permit included with facility rental.
- Depth of water
  - Length of dock – concepts show 125ft and 200ft - how does this compare to nearby facilities:
    - Log boom +/-620 ft long
    - Civic club – 290 ft long
    - LCW Preserve – 160 ft long (extends farther landward than concepts)
  - PRAB wants to better understand where wading vs. swimming would be possible – How far out will the dock need to go to swim? Is there the depth necessary for swimming ?
    - Concepts based on best information available at the time; goal of option selection is to choose the preferred beach and dock program
    - Survey with bathymetry nearly completed, future dock design (of either option) will reflect lake bottom information
  - Currently no fencing is shown in design concepts
    - Fencing can be added to design or planned as eventual retrofit if needed
    - Fencing not included in cost estimates
  - Clarification from Council Liaison on role of PRAB – Should recommendation reflect what is in the best interest of the community or what is budget oriented?
    - Request is a ‘layed recommendations for council...’ should reflect ‘what is preferred and what is a priority... what is acceptable’ from a budget standpoint
  - Budget and funding
    - Identifying and seeking funding is the goal.
    - No project construction budget has been set. Design team given Log Boom and Łaŋwadis (TI' awh-ah-dees) Park as relative low and high budget constraints. Cost estimates for concept options returned in that range.
    - Community contributions should be allowed; design team to include opportunities for community funding in design development (e.g., buy a brick)
    - Potential for legislative requests for funding would require specificity of what is proposed and what is being paid for, what is funding need and would demonstrate real return. Time is tight for requests. Potential ideas:
      - Preserve restoration including dock removal
      - Right-of-way improvements including sidewalk and crosswalk
    - Preliminary design and community support has contributed to past success with city requests for state funding – likely put us in the position for next year
    - City has a lobbyist working on their behalf current; Councilmember Bodi offered to connect with the Mayor on feasibility of moving forward with project-related requests this session.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

**ADJOURN: 9:30PM**